

From one side we hear a warning 'Sign the Pledge,' and from the other, an invitation 'Set down that Glass,' and in the other 'Philadelphia lager beer,' in one ear 'Don't Unchain the Tiger,' and in the other 'Pleasant Summer Drinks.' On one side the Tract Society announces 'One Glass More,' and on the other they go in and take it.

But there are other tracts on other subjects in the Tract Society's window. For instance, there is one 'A Strange Thing; and there is another 'Will it Ever be Known?' Then there is also 'The Bold Blasphemer,' and a companion-piece 'The Necessity of Repentance.'

In addition to the above, there are two other conspicuous tracts, one of which the Tract Society itself should read without delay, while the other should be given to its French Confectioner; they are 'The Fatal Mistake,' and 'To a Retailer in Ardent Spirits.' In the meantime perhaps there is need of another 'Committee of Investigation' to inquire into the constitutionality of the office of French Confectioner to the American Tract Society.

MR. GARRISON REVIEWED.

We were somewhat surprised to hear that Rev. J. B. Johnson, pastor of the Universalist Society in Milford, had preached a discourse animating against the late lecture of Mr. Garrison in the Town Hall. And still more we were surprised, on reading a report of that discourse, in the Milford Journal of August 22d, to learn that Mr. Johnson had said such things and opinions therein set forth. We will briefly notice some of these views and opinions.

Mr. J. is reported to have said:

'So, for liberty to the land and all the inhabitants thereof, will the church pray and labor. For this I am hopeful, and for this consumption so devoutly to be wished, will my brethren I earnestly and assiduously labor to promote. But how is this to be done? Is it to be accomplished by casting the pro-slavery man and slaveholder beyond the circle of human sympathy and human regard? In listening to our radical friends, one would be led very naturally to think that the pro-slavery portion of the community is annihilated, and that a community of liberty-loving men be created to take their places; and then slavery might be abolished. But he thought that the process was to be simply this:—The slaveholder will become converted to free labor, because he will see more money will be made by it. The church and the ministry will become more thoroughly imbued with the spirit of their great Teacher, and the events of God's providence, acting in harmony with these facts, will aid and nourish the growth of the true idea of human rights—man's individual sovereignty.'

Two processes for the abolition of slavery are described in this extract: one the process of 'our radical friends,' Mr. Garrison and his coadjutors—the other, Mr. Johnson's approved process. The Garrisonian process 'is to be accomplished by casting the pro-slavery man and slaveholder beyond the circle of human sympathy and regard'—so that the pro-slavery portion of the community should be annihilated. Now is it possible that Mr. J. understands 'our radical friends' to propose any such annihilating treatment of slaveholders and pro-slavery people? So far from this, we have simply insisted that slaveholders, and all who sympathize with them, on the sacred rights of their weaker fellow-creatures, which must be for their own good as well as that of others. We rank them as capital criminals, and desire only that they should be dispossessed, rebuked and restrained, just as we would have all other great criminals dealt with. And as to pro-slavery people, we simply insist that they shall cease to stand up for slaveholders as no worse than the generality of uncriminal citizens in any country; thereby keeping them in countenance, encouraging them in their crimes, and sustaining them in their gigantic wickedness. Is there anything wrong in all this? Is any injury designed against slaveholders and pro-slavery people? If all this should be done, would any of them be injured? Would anybody be injured? Would anybody be cast out of the pale of 'human sympathy,' and annihilated? Would not the now outraged slaves, the slaveholders, their pro-slavery accessories, the country and the human race be incomparably better off? Are we to recognize capital criminals as respectable citizens, worthy to be governors of the nation, in state and church, by voting at the polls and in legislative assemblies; and if we will not thus recognize, but consider them moral and political outlaws so long as they persist in their crimes, is this casting them 'beyond the circle of human sympathy,' and annihilating them? If so, then there is no such thing as being the friends of murderers, man-stealers, robbers, and other capital criminals, without uniting and co-acting with them in political compacts as worthy fellows. We believe in no such doctrine. It is not friendship towards a criminal to stand up for him as a well-known member of the community, and to give aid to the injured part of the community whose welfare he is injuring.

But what is Mr. Johnson's approved process for the abolition of slavery? 'Simply this: the slaveholder will be converted to free labor, because he will see more money will be made by it.' The church and the ministry will become more thoroughly imbued with the spirit of their great Teacher, and the events of God's providence, acting in harmony with these facts, will aid and nourish the growth of human rights—man's individual sovereignty.' We must confess that this is to us a very strange and unsatisfactory process to be commended by a professed minister of Christ. So long as the slaveholder thinks that more money is to be made by robbing his weaker fellow-men of all their rights, he is to be regarded and treated like speculators in stocks, lands, flour, etc., i. e., considered respectable, and allowed to learn, by experience, the best ways of making money? He is not a man-stealer, is he, nor a man-stealer's heir and assign? Is he only driving a bad speculation? A tolerably good fellow, after all, only perhaps a little mistaken about the best plan of making money? Would Mr. Johnson think so, if he and his dear ones were the victims of those shrewd and sensibilities the money was being made? 'We know not.' Is this the highest moral ground of the church and ministry in the noon of the nineteenth century? Are they yet so little imbued as this 'with the spirit of their great Teacher'? Have the events of God's Providence failed to give them a sterner conscience than this against the blackest of crimes? If not, what hope have we of their progress during the next ten thousand years? They can see that burglars, forgers, counterfeiters and common thieves are too great criminals to tolerate, however fast for the time being they may make money by their crimes; but slaveholders and their accessories, though trampling outrageously on the most sacred rights of millions, are possibly good citizens. These are to be sympathized with, and treated with respectful consideration, until they become converted to free labor by being convinced that more money can be made by it? We had understood, heretofore, that Mr. Johnson was an Anti-Slavery man. But if this is really his position, and he shall act consistently with it, we are sure that the most inveterate slaveholders will tolerate him as liberally as he does them; leaving the events of God's Providence, or the experience of business, to determine, in every man's case, whether most money is to be made by outrageous plunder, or voluntary exchange of equivalents. Some slaveholders, however, might possibly make the 'almighty dollar' of economy account, and hold on to the patriarchal institution for the sake of other advantages or gratifications afforded by it. But it is presumed that if they were allowed to retain their present standing in good society, they would not complain. For this matter of retaining a respectable standing in society is the main point, and even more so, the pleasure-takers of the most unscrupulous sort are very anxious to be deemed respectable in society, so that they can stand, like our slaveholders, high in their civil and political, if not in their ecclesiastical standing. They do not like to be reckoned in the category of felons, and the unscrupulousness of the Garrisonians is, that they doggedly persist in denouncing slaveholders as capital felons, and in charging all pro-slavery people, in church and state, with being the accessories of felons. But if all this can be smothered down as *infidelity and treason*, and anti-slavery resolved into mere opposition to the unprofitableness of the peculiar institution, then the whole controversy will become perfectly harmless. The pros and the antis can amicably differ on the common plane of social and political good fellowship; and all parties will retain their hitherto respectability; and above all, the church will have ample time to become more thoroughly imbued with the spirit of Christ as to feel that man-stealers, their heirs and assigns, are no more fit for religious or civil society than the smaller felons they now treat as outlaws. This last is a consummation devoutly to be wished.

But we proceed to remark, that Mr. Johnson, in other parts of the same discourse, professes and claims credit for a kind of anti-slavery quite inconsistent with the mere anti-slavery one just considered.

I know, said the speaker, that the Old School Presbyterians and the Episcopal church, to a great extent, are open to the charge of being pro-slavery. As ecclesiastical bodies, they have always taken a stand against anti-slavery movements, and some of their D. D.'s have uttered sentiments on the subject of slavery perfectly diabolical. No one can utter his abhorrence of such men and their opinions in too strong or too caustic terms.

We should like to know what the Old School Presbyterians, Episcopalians, or anybody else, have ever said or done contrary to Mr. Johnson's process for abolishing slavery. Have they ever objected to the slaveholder's being converted by the simple conviction that slavery is unprofitable, and abolishing it because more money can be made by free labor? We think not. The most ultra slaveholders ask only to be let alone, that they may manage slavery in their own way, make it profitable if they can, and give it up when they are fully convinced that they can do better. Still all the pro-slavery men, whether in politics or religion, say, 'Let the slaveholders alone. Religion has nothing to do with slavery *per se*; neither have political parties. It is a mere pecuniary and social question, which the slaveholders alone have the right to settle in their own time and way.' Is not this exactly according to Mr. Johnson's process? Why then does Mr. Johnson, the Old School Presbyterians, Episcopalians, etc., have they not done the right and wise thing in keeping clear of this agitation; i. e., if his process be the true one? Plainly they have. Nevertheless, he calls some of their sentiments 'perfectly diabolical,' and says, 'No one can utter his abhorrence of such men and their opinions in too strong or too caustic terms.' How so? What abhorrence do they deserve? Wherein have they sinned?—Here is something to be explained.

Again, Mr. Johnson refers to the protest of the three thousand clergymen against the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, as a gross error, and a most unprofitably commendable in itself, and powerful in its effect. But if his own process for abolishing slavery be the true one, that protest was an objectionable proceeding. It thrust religion and morals into a question which was merely pecuniary and political. This is just what Senator Douglas and the Democratic politicians all complained of and denounced. 'This,' said they, 'is a mere question of dollars and cents, and of secular politics. If the slaveholders think they can make slavery profitable in Kansas, give them a fair chance for their Northern brethren to try it. They will find out what is their interest. Give them an open field for free play. They have a right to this. But you, clergymen, rush in with uplifted hands to stay the proceeding, as if some sacrilegious act, some great wickedness was about to be committed.'—Douglas told them that they were meddling with matters which they did not understand—to go about their own business, and not cease to state men and politicians with religious interjections, and to interfere in secular affairs. If slavery is to be abolished simply by the slaveholders finding out how to make the most money, Douglas was right, and the ministers were wrong. They should either have been silent, or only published arguments addressed to the slaveholders, demonstrating that free labor is more profitable than slave labor—respectfully leaving them to consider and decide the matter for themselves.

But it is idle to play see-saw. Slaveholding is a crime *per se*, or no crime. If a crime at all, it is one of the greatest that can be committed by man, and must be dealt with accordingly—no matter how much money may be made by it. In that view, it is just as robbery, piracy, forgery, counterfeiting and swindling. Do professed Christians, moralists, and civilians ever think of leaving robbers, pirates, forgers, counterfeiters, swindlers, etc., to go about their own business, and not cease to state men and politicians with religious interjections, and to interfere in secular affairs. If slavery is to be abolished simply by the slaveholders finding out how to make the most money, Douglas was right, and the ministers were wrong. They should either have been silent, or only published arguments addressed to the slaveholders, demonstrating that free labor is more profitable than slave labor—respectfully leaving them to consider and decide the matter for themselves.

But it is idle to play see-saw. Slaveholding is a crime *per se*, or no crime. If a crime at all, it is one of the greatest that can be committed by man, and must be dealt with accordingly—no matter how much money may be made by it. In that view, it is just as robbery, piracy, forgery, counterfeiting and swindling. Do professed Christians, moralists, and civilians ever think of leaving robbers, pirates, forgers, counterfeiters, swindlers, etc., to go about their own business, and not cease to state men and politicians with religious interjections, and to interfere in secular affairs. If slavery is to be abolished simply by the slaveholders finding out how to make the most money, Douglas was right, and the ministers were wrong. They should either have been silent, or only published arguments addressed to the slaveholders, demonstrating that free labor is more profitable than slave labor—respectfully leaving them to consider and decide the matter for themselves.

But it is idle to play see-saw. Slaveholding is a crime *per se*, or no crime. If a crime at all, it is one of the greatest that can be committed by man, and must be dealt with accordingly—no matter how much money may be made by it. In that view, it is just as robbery, piracy, forgery, counterfeiting and swindling. Do professed Christians, moralists, and civilians ever think of leaving robbers, pirates, forgers, counterfeiters, swindlers, etc., to go about their own business, and not cease to state men and politicians with religious interjections, and to interfere in secular affairs. If slavery is to be abolished simply by the slaveholders finding out how to make the most money, Douglas was right, and the ministers were wrong. They should either have been silent, or only published arguments addressed to the slaveholders, demonstrating that free labor is more profitable than slave labor—respectfully leaving them to consider and decide the matter for themselves.

Garrison has taken his position, and hews a straight line through whatever opposes, without respect of institutions, persons, places or times. If the church and ministry are assailed by his blows, he can do them no final harm. Because, if he is right in the main, his blows will only cut away the nine-tenths of all the *long file* inhabitants, and to brand them as actuated by a treasonable spirit, because they will not recognize, as binding upon them, a government and laws imposed upon them by invading bandits from the Southern States!

Mark his threat to bring the whole military power of the Federal Government to exterminate them, if need be, in case they refuse to bow the neck and bend the knee! Observe, too, his insulting reference to the Hartford Convention—as if there were the remotest analogy between the two cases! Falsehood, insubordination and consummate hypocrisy constitute the 'warp and woof' of his entire letter; yet it will be applauded and endorsed by the servile minions of the Administration, from one end of the country to the other—the slave-mongers and cradle-plunderers leading off in shouts of satanic exultation! The most intolerable portion of it is that where its slavery-ridden author prates about having the approbation of his conscience, [the conscience of an unscrupulous demagogue,] and of his God, [a slaveholding demon,] and sanctimoniously talks about placing his trust in Divine Providence, to enable him 'to do equal justice to all portions of the Union'! In the annals of human dissembling, what can surpass this?

Simultaneous with the appearance of this ominous Letter comes the intelligence from Kansas, that, at a recent convention of the Free State party, it was resolved to waive all their scruples, and to participate in the October election, along with the border ruffians, relying upon Gov. Walker's promise of fair play at the polls!—Rollinson, Lane, Pomeroy, all have at last 'caved in'! 'Put not your trust in princes,' or politicians!

Further—it is announced that Judge BENJAMIN R. CURTIS has resigned his seat on the bench of the Supreme Court of the United States. His plea is, a wish to attend to his private and pecuniary matters; but there is no doubt that such a pressure has been brought to bear upon him, in consequence of his able and upright decision in the Dred Scott case, that he cannot stand under it, and heighly begs a retreat. It is rumored that either Toucey of Connecticut, Cushing of Massachusetts, or Clifford of Maine, will be his successor—either of them being as traitorous to the rights and interests of the North, and as servile a tool to perform all their mandates, as the slave oligarchy can desire.

A venerable statesman of this Commonwealth was heard to denounce, in the strongest language, Judge Curtis's resignation, as an act of most culpable desertion of his post and duty, to which he had allowed himself to be driven by the sneers and frowns of his Southern associates and former intimates at Washington—saying, also, that, if the compensation of the office were inadequate, that fact was unworthy of notice or thought for a moment, and that he (Curtis) should have staid, and starved there, if necessary.

All these things indicate, not only the omnipotence of the Slave Power, but that no dissent whatever is to be tolerated from its worst designs and most insupportable acts; that it is in vain to look to the Supreme Court for any decision favorable to the cause of freedom; that, while the present Union lasts, no check can be put upon the aggressions of the South upon the rights and liberties of the North; and that THE TIME HAS COME FOR SEPARATION.

The Liberator.

NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS.

BOSTON, SEPTEMBER 11, 1857.

CALL FOR A NORTHERN CONVENTION.

Whereas, it must be obvious to all, that the American Union is constantly becoming more and more divided, by Slavery, into two distinct and antagonistic nations, between whom harmony is impossible, and even ordinary intercourse is becoming dangerous;

And, whereas, Slavery has now gained entire control over the three branches of our National Government, Executive, Judiciary, and Legislative; has so interpreted the Constitution as to deny the right of Congress to establish freedom even in the territories; and by the same process has removed all legal protection from a large portion of the people of the free States, and has inflicted, at many times and places, outrages far greater than those which our fathers rose in arms to repel;

And, whereas, there seems no probability that the future will, in these respects, be different from the past, under existing State relations;

The undersigned respectfully invite their fellow-citizens of the Free States to meet in Convention, at CLEVELAND, (Ohio), on WEDNESDAY and THURSDAY, October 28th and 29th, 1857, to consider the practicability, probability, and expediency of a separation of the Free and Slave States, and to take such other measures as the condition of the times may require.

The Committee, to whom the duty of making all necessary arrangements for this Convention was entrusted, have decided upon CLEVELAND, (Ohio), as the place, and WEDNESDAY and THURSDAY, October 28th and 29th, as the time for holding it. The list of signers of the Call is not yet completed; and a few days longer will be allowed, to enable those who mean to have their names enrolled, and have not yet done so, to execute their purpose.

Several thousand names have been received, already, no systematic measures whatsoever have been taken to procure signatures. Unquestionably, by a very little effort, many thousands more might easily be obtained. Thus far, Ohio sends the largest number; and it is due to her, especially on account of her geographical position, and the insolent attempts of the Slave Power to desecrate her soil and humble her in the dust, to hold the Convention at the central point already designated—namely, CLEVELAND. We shall expect a strong attendance from the Western Republic.

New England, as yet, is behind the West in the interest manifested in the Convention, judging from the number of those who have signed the Call; yet, in preparation of mind to give it a strong support, we doubt not she takes the lead. But there has been a strange remissness on the part of our Anti-Slavery friends, in regard to procuring signatures to the Call—as, for instance, in such places as Providence, (R. I.), Salem, Lowell, Newburyport, New Bedford, Plymouth, (Mass.), Portsmouth, (N. H.), Portland and Bangor, (Me.), &c., &c. We know of scores of prominent Abolitionists, who have not yet recorded their names, simply because they have allowed the matter to pass out of their minds. Will they not, forthwith, signify to the Secretary, JOSEPH A. HOWLAND, at Worcester, their wish to be included in the list of signers? If they need to be urged to attend to so simple a duty, what can be expected of those who make far less of anti-slavery pretension than themselves? By an active improvement of the time yet remaining, the number of signers can easily be augmented to ten thousand. Send in the names!

The necessity for a Dissolution of the present blood-cemented Union with the South, if the North would stand erect and free, and give the death-blow to the hateful slave system, is becoming more and more apparent to all reflecting minds. Every hour it is allowed to exist, witnesses new machinations and fresh encroachments on the part of the Slave Power, to establish its omnipresent and omnipotent sway over the whole country, to the extinction of all the principles of freedom, and the subversion of all free institutions. No greater treason to the cause of Liberty can be committed than to stand by such a Union.

See how the chains of Southern mastery and overbearing, usurpation and tyranny, are strengthening, day by day! First, read the pregnant Letter of Pres. Buchanan to Prof. Silliman and other eminent citizens of Connecticut, with regard to Kansas! See how he dares to proclaim the Free State settlers of that territory to be no part of the people, (though constituting nine-tenths of all the *long file* inhabitants), and to brand them as actuated by a treasonable spirit, because they will not recognize, as binding upon them, a government and laws imposed upon them by invading bandits from the Southern States!

Mark his threat to bring the whole military power of the Federal Government to exterminate them, if need be, in case they refuse to bow the neck and bend the knee! Observe, too, his insulting reference to the Hartford Convention—as if there were the remotest analogy between the two cases! Falsehood, insubordination and consummate hypocrisy constitute the 'warp and woof' of his entire letter; yet it will be applauded and endorsed by the servile minions of the Administration, from one end of the country to the other—the slave-mongers and cradle-plunderers leading off in shouts of satanic exultation! The most intolerable portion of it is that where its slavery-ridden author prates about having the approbation of his conscience, [the conscience of an unscrupulous demagogue,] and of his God, [a slaveholding demon,] and sanctimoniously talks about placing his trust in Divine Providence, to enable him 'to do equal justice to all portions of the Union'! In the annals of human dissembling, what can surpass this?

Simultaneous with the appearance of this ominous Letter comes the intelligence from Kansas, that, at a recent convention of the Free State party, it was resolved to waive all their scruples, and to participate in the October election, along with the border ruffians, relying upon Gov. Walker's promise of fair play at the polls!—Rollinson, Lane, Pomeroy, all have at last 'caved in'! 'Put not your trust in princes,' or politicians!

Further—it is announced that Judge BENJAMIN R. CURTIS has resigned his seat on the bench of the Supreme Court of the United States. His plea is, a wish to attend to his private and pecuniary matters; but there is no doubt that such a pressure has been brought to bear upon him, in consequence of his able and upright decision in the Dred Scott case, that he cannot stand under it, and heighly begs a retreat. It is rumored that either Toucey of Connecticut, Cushing of Massachusetts, or Clifford of Maine, will be his successor—either of them being as traitorous to the rights and interests of the North, and as servile a tool to perform all their mandates, as the slave oligarchy can desire.

A venerable statesman of this Commonwealth was heard to denounce, in the strongest language, Judge Curtis's resignation, as an act of most culpable desertion of his post and duty, to which he had allowed himself to be driven by the sneers and frowns of his Southern associates and former intimates at Washington—saying, also, that, if the compensation of the office were inadequate, that fact was unworthy of notice or thought for a moment, and that he (Curtis) should have staid, and starved there, if necessary.

All these things indicate, not only the omnipotence of the Slave Power, but that no dissent whatever is to be tolerated from its worst designs and most insupportable acts; that it is in vain to look to the Supreme Court for any decision favorable to the cause of freedom; that, while the present Union lasts, no check can be put upon the aggressions of the South upon the rights and liberties of the North; and that THE TIME HAS COME FOR SEPARATION.

DISSOLUTION OF THE UNION.

ROCK ISLAND CO., Ill., Aug. 20, 1857.

JOSEPH A. HOWLAND, Esq.:

DEAR SIR,—I enclose you the 'Call for a Convention' to discuss the propriety of dissolving this Confederation, with my signature thereto.

In signing this Call, let me say that I am opposed to dissolving the Union, because I do not deem it necessary to abolish slavery. Why, then, some of my old friends may ask, put your name to a 'treasonable' document emanating from 'fanatics'? I reply, because a large majority of the people, of all parties in politics, and all sects in religion, are such fanatical and idolatrous worshippers at the shrine of the Union, or 'nation,' as they call this Confederacy, that they either forget the reserved rights of the States, or the sacred rights of humanity. In my humble opinion, the Federal Constitution, strictly construed, gives no sanction or support to slavery, in any one conceivable form. This may be an error, but, if so, it is on the side of humanity, and is fully sustained, as genuine Democracy, by the following extract from the Virginia resolutions of 1798:—

'That this Assembly doth explicitly and pre-emptorily declare, that it views the powers of the Federal Government as resulting from the compact to which the States are parties, as limited by the plain sense and intention of the instrument constituting that compact.'

If it is treason for any portion of the States to secede from the Union, then we live under a despotism as cruel as ever cursed the civilized world; and the sublime and cheering doctrine of the Declaration of Independence is sheer nonsense. The absurd theory that these States form 'one nation' acquired its present popularity from Gen. Jackson's 'Proclamation,'—a Proclamation which he had no more right to issue than had the Czar of Russia,—a Proclamation which falsifies historical facts, and converts this Confederacy of free, sovereign and independent States into a consolidated despotism, leaving not even the shadow of the original States. What is a State? Let our own learned lexicographer answer: 'State: a kingdom or republic.' If this definition be correct, and it is also true that these thirty-one States, as they are yet termed, are consolidated into 'one nation,' it follows, as an irresistible conclusion from the premises, that every vestige of the original States is annihilated. What mockery, then, to talk of 'States,'—not to mention 'free, sovereign and independent States'! The most talented advocate of this false theory cannot escape the result to which it leads. I say false theory, because the Federal Constitution itself asserts its falsity, by asserting the existence of the States; and if they are States, then they are 'kingdoms or republics'; and while they remain such, it is sheer nonsense to say that they constitute another State, and thus form thirty-two instead of thirty-one States. But it is said that 'a State is not a nation.' Then a State is not a State. But the fact is incontrovertible, that State or Commonwealth is but another name for a nation.

Now, what is a nation? The same distinguished lexicographer defines the word 'nation' to mean, 'a body of people under one government.' The people of these consolidated States, as a whole, are not 'under one government.' This point cannot be controverted. The people of Massachusetts are under one government, and thus, according to Mr. Webster, are a 'nation.'

Now for the facts in the case. The State Government, in connection with the Federal Government, constitutes a whole Government, under which the people of Massachusetts live,—and so of every State in the Union. That it takes the two systems to constitute a whole government for each State, Mr. Jefferson has so clearly shown that no sane man will gainsay his impregnable position. To sustain this false theory, the 'Proclamation' and its devotees assert, without a particle of proof, that 'the allegiance of their [the States] citizens was transferred, in the first instance, to the government of the United States.' Who ever heard of 'allegiance' being due, under our republican system, to government? Allegiance is due to the sovereign power, let that reside where it may. If sovereignty resides in the people of each State, as a separate community, then allegiance is due to this sovereign power. If, on the other hand, sovereignty resides with the people of the United States, as one community, then allegiance is due to that sovereign authority; but it can in no case be due to government, which is the mere agent of the sovereign people.

Now, where does Massachusetts assert that sovereignty resides, and to whom the allegiance of her citizens is due? Her Constitution requires the following test oath: 'I truly and sincerely acknowledge, testify and declare, that the Commonwealth of Massachusetts is, and of right ought to be, a free, sovereign and independent State; and I will bear true faith and allegiance to said Commonwealth.'

Again: the 'Proclamation,' to bolster up this false theory, insinuates that sovereignty is divided between the States, as States, and the Federal Government, and its devotees shout 'Amen' even to this absurdity. Now, as allegiance cannot be due, by the same people, to two sovereigns, so neither can sovereignty be divided. The word 'sovereign,' Webster defines to be 'supreme in power; supreme ruler.' Sovereignty, then, is of necessity indivisible, and will not bear comparison, as—Massachusetts is a sovereign State, the United States is a more sovereign 'nation,' and the Federal Government is most sovereign. Of course, in defiance of the Federal Constitution, construed in accordance with the good old Democratic doctrine laid down in the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions, the sovereignty and reserved rights of Massachusetts, and the sacred rights of humanity, it enacts and enforces that accursed usurpation, the Fugitive Slave Law.

Now, which is right, and obligatory on the people of Massachusetts, Gen. Jackson's 'Proclamation,' or the Constitution of Massachusetts, as to where sovereignty resides, and to whom the allegiance of her citizens is due? Every man who loves liberty and detests slavery, and every Democrat who venerates the political principles of the immortal Jefferson, must enthusiastically respond, 'Massachusetts.' If Massachusetts is a sovereign State, and the allegiance of her citizens is due to the sovereign power of the State, she cannot possibly commit treason against the United States by peacefully seceding from the Union; the hanging propensity of the New York Observer to the contrary notwithstanding.

Secession is not only a natural, but a reserved right, inherent in that State sovereignty to which Massachusetts, by her Constitution, requires an oath of allegiance.

It has been said that the State and Federal Governments, as a whole, constitute the government of Massachusetts. This had it not the sanction of Mr. Jefferson, is proved by two undeniable facts. First, that the Federal Government cannot pass laws to punish murder and other crimes committed by the citizens of Massachusetts within her limits; and, second, that her State government cannot pass laws to regulate her foreign policy. These two governments combined, then, the government of Massachusetts, and of no other State, nation or people under heaven, which that venerates the doctrine of the Declaration of Independence dare deny. That whenever her government becomes destructive of these ends, [the ends for which she instituted it,] it is the right of her people to alter or abolish it, and to institute a new government, laying its foundations on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness.'

As the 'Proclamation' and its devotees are forced to admit that a State has a natural right to secede from the Union, I will grant that the preceding propositions are false, and then see how the case stands on

the question of natural rights. The Federal Government has no natural rights, and I deny that it has a constitutional right to usurp and enforce power, and then coerce Massachusetts into subordination and vassalage, should her people, planting themselves on their natural rights, secede from the Union, rather than implicate themselves, as they now do, in the crime of slavery, by permitting to be enforced within their limits that vile usurpation, the Fugitive Slave Law,—an usurpation of power (cautionally reserved by the States from Federal interference) which throws into the shade every charge brought against the British Government in the Declaration of Independence.

In conclusion, let me say, God speed this discussion! as it is, perhaps, the only movement that can open the eyes of the people to the government.

Yours, in the cause of State Rights and Humanity.

B. G. WRIGHT.

The following reply to Sigma has been denied a place in the Transcript, though that old villain has been permitted to use its columns without stint, number after number, with his malignant attacks upon Mr. PILLBURY and ourselves. Such editorial favoritism, whose character is assailed, is meaner than picking pockets or robbing hen-roosts; but Sigma requires it, and his royal displeasure must not be incurred. Shame on such truckling!

SIGMA AND THE DOGS MUZZLED.

To the Editor of the Transcript:

Sir,—In the Transcript of the 13th ult., I declared, both as an eye and ear witness, that the charge brought by Sigma against Parker Pillsbury, of having publicly baptized three dogs, in mockery of religion and the ordinances, was base, malicious, and utterly destitute of truth. In reply to his declaration, that he had 'letters from gentlemen of Danvers, of the first respectability, confirming the statement, in all its minute particulars, upon the testimony of eye and ear witnesses,' I challenged him to produce either witness or letter in a tangible shape. How has he met the challenge? By renewing his atrociously wicked accusation, without presenting a particle of evidence; and by making the columns of the Transcript, week after week, a sewer through which to discharge upon my head a torrent of malignant invective and personal defamation.

Ridiculous like this—'cursing like a very drab'—is beneath serious refutation. Member, Sigma plumes himself upon being both a Christian and a gentleman! Never was self-delusion ever greater. To reach his abyssal position, in order to stand on his own level and to meet him with his own weapons, one must make a lower descent than did the rebellious angels!—

—Headlong themselves they threw.

Convicted of slander, Sigma seeks to change the issue, and to escape the scorn and indignation of all upright men, by acting the part of the cuttle-fish, and riling the waters, so as not to be transfixed. It is an old and scaly trick, but it will not answer his purpose. No matter what shape he assumes—whether he 'o'er bog or steep, through straits, rough, dense or rare, With head, hands, wings, or feet, pursues his way, And swims, or sinks, or wades, or creeps, or flies'—his exposure is inevitable—his capture certain.

The point in dispute is not whether I am an 'infidel,' or a 'bully,' or 'a pernicious citizen,' or 'foolish and frantic,' or 'a notorious blasphemer,' or 'the devil's printer,'—nor does it relate to my biblical or abbatist views,—but it is solely as to the truth of the following accusation made by Sigma against me, the latches of whose shoes he is 'not worthy to unloose':—

'Parker Pillsbury, some years ago, performed, in public, the ceremony of baptizing three dogs, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.'

This was Sigma's original, naked, unqualified charge—leading every unsuspecting reader of the Transcript naturally to suppose that, to outrage the religious feelings of the community, Mr. Pillsbury actually and literally did the absurd and monstrous deed attributed to him! Subsequently, Sigma adds that Mr. P. did it 'in consonance with his opposition to the Sabbath, to bring the ordinance of baptism also into contempt'!! His first witness is, the anonymous author of the story in the Salem Register, who dares not to avow himself under his own proper signature, and upon whose lying statement all the changes that have since been rung upon Mr. Pillsbury's 'blasphemy,' by the enemies of the Anti-Slavery cause, have been based! His next witness is a Mr. '—' (all in the dark again!) who said, 'he was positive that Pillsbury offered the dogs bread and wine, after he had baptized them, and taken them into the church.' What next? Pushed to the wall, Sigma coolly says—'Of course, neither dog, nor bread, nor wine, were actually present. What! all gone into thin air! Since the days of veracious Jack Falstaff, has there ever been story-telling equal to this? No dogs, no bread, no wine! I am humbled upon poor four of us... I am a rogue, if I were not at half-wad with a dozen of them two hours together... Sixteen, at least, my lord... If fought not with fifty of them, I am a bunch of radish; if there were not two or three and fifty upon poor old Jack, then I am no two-legged creature... Four rogues in buckram let drive at me; I made no more ado, but took all their seven points in my target... These nine men in buckram, that I told thee of—with a thought, seven of the eleven I paid! Well, to the fabrications of Sigma and his anonymous baker may be justly applied the language of Prince Henry to Falstaff's assertions:—'These lies are like the father that begets them; gross as a mountain, open, palpable.'

But Sigma has another dodge:—It is well understood that this was a mock ceremony throughout! Nothing left of the story but a mockery! But this representation is equally false. Mr. Pillsbury has denied it, in the most explicit manner, in the Transcript, in addition to my own positive contradiction. Of the hundreds who were present, not one comes forward to contradict our statements, or in support of Sigma. No 'mock ceremony,' with or without dogs, was performed on the occasion. All that Mr. Pillsbury did—after showing how slavery degrades man to the level of a beast, and in order to give a new and thrilling view of its enormity—was, to put the question to the audience, with true solemnity of feeling and manner, 'What would be said of the clergyman, [ay! let Sigma answer!] who should bring certain dogs into the church, and proceed to baptize them, one by one, as Hodge, Tiger, or Lion, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost?' And he promptly added, 'Would not a thrill of horror run through the community, in view of such a blasphemous procedure?' And yet, which is the more blasphemous act—to turn men into brutes, or ceremonially to treat brutes as though they were men?—a question which Sigma will please to answer, if he dare! This was the sum and substance of all that Mr. Pillsbury said and did; and if Sigma can see no pertinency, nay, nothing but 'blasphemy' in the illustration, then, if he were 'brayed in a mortar seven times, yet would not his foolishness depart from him.' Mark how plain a tale puts him down, and subjects him to infinite ridicule! And now, Sigma, 'what trick, what device, what starting-hole, canst thou now find out, to hide thee from this open and apparent shame?'

Before dismissing him and his canine pets, let me again ask, upon what evidence does Sigma charge Mr. Pillsbury with the grave offence of casting ridicule upon one of the sacraments of the Christian religion, which he urges upon him in terms so offensive? A statement made in an anonymous communication in the Salem Register, and written by an enemy, which has been contradicted and disproved as often as it has come to the knowledge of Mr. Pillsbury or his friends! Does Sigma mean to be understood that the asser-

tions—even the uncontradicted assertions—of newspapers are to be received as evidence of the truth of the charges conveyed in them? It must be to the citizens, that the Boston Times, in an article published on the 4th of May, 18—, made charges, against Sigma, against morality and the law. Does Sigma mean to have it understood that these charges are to be taken as true, because made in a newspaper? And yet the article was not anonymous, like that against Mr. Pillsbury, but written by a responsible editor, who, it is his wish to be proceeded against, either for damages or by way of indictment. And I have never heard of any contradiction or denial on his part. I do not affirm that those charges were true, on this account; but I do say, that such an inference might be made, far more reasonably, on his own rule of evidence, than by any proof he has yet brought forward.

Sigma, in company with Capt. Josiah Ryals, and of his band of ruffians, to be the champions of the Union, the Bible, the Christian Sabbath, &c., at my reasonable and irreligious sentiments—some perverted, the other for an indictment

